



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,619	07/03/2003	Douglas J. Allen	X-11666C	4376
25885	7590	04/02/2007		
ELI LILLY & COMPANY PATENT DIVISION P.O. BOX 6288 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288			EXAMINER FUBARA, BLESSING M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/02/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/02/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@lilly.com

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner acknowledges receipt of request for continued examination and remarks filed 12/12/2006. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-17, 21-24 and 34 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/12/2006 has been entered.

Status of the claims

The claims filed December 20, 2004 are pending. In the amendment filed 12/20/2004, claims 2, 8, 9, 18-20 and 25-33 are cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 5, 17 and 34 are amended. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-17, 21-24 and 34 are pending. Attorney Nelson L. Lentz authorized the cancellation of claim 24 in the interview of 9/29/06. However, since the allowed claims have not been issued and since applicant requested reconsideration of the claims, applicant may cancel at least claim 24 in response to this action. Thus, claims 1, 3-7, 10-17, 21-24 and 34 are considered in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-17 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is new matter rejection.

Sustained release has a release date of up to 30 days and greater than 7 days, which includes greater than 30 days is not supported (see paragraph [0058] of the published application).

NB: Attorney Nelson L. Lentz authorized amendment of claim 1 with respect to 7 days and 30 days in the interview of 9/29/06. See below for action necessary to overcome this rejection, which is commensurate with the interview of 9/29/06.

5. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-17 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is written description.

Art Unit: 1618

Claim 1 requires “oleaginous carrier” and “cholesterol microsphere carrier.” Dependent claim 4 limits the carrier to non-ionic copolymers of propylene oxide and ethylene oxide, cellulose gums, polysaccharide gums, vegetable oils, refined fractionated oils, sucrose diacetate hexaisobutyrate, lecithin and polyvinyl pyrrolidone. There is no description stating which carrier is “oleaginous” and which carrier is “cholesterol microsphere carrier.”

6. Claims 4-7, 10-17 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 requires “oleaginous carrier” and “cholesterol microsphere carrier.” Dependent claim 4 limits the carrier to non-ionic copolymers of propylene oxide and ethylene oxide, cellulose gums, polysaccharide gums, vegetable oils, refined fractionated oils, sucrose diacetate hexaisobutyrate, lecithin and polyvinyl pyrrolidone.

It is not clear how the carriers in claims 4 and 5 limit “oleaginous carrier” or “cholesterol microsphere carrier”. Oleaginous is understood to mean oily (see page 866 of the second college edition of The American Heritage Dictionary, 1976). Propylene oxide-ethylene oxide copolymer (PLURONIC), cellulosic gum, polysaccharide gum, chitosan and sucrose diacetate hexaisobutyrate are not within the scope of oils or “oleaginous” as claimed. Claims 4, 5 and 17 define “oleaginous carrier or cholesterol microsphere carrier” as being the various polymers recited in these claims, which is repugnant to the definition of oleaginous or cholesterol.

Furthermore, for claim 17, propylene oxide-ethylene oxide copolymer (PLURONIC), cellulosic gum and polysaccharide gum do not appear to be oleaginous or oils.

Art Unit: 1618

Claim 6 depends on canceled claim 2.

The particle size recited in claim 24 is outside the particle size recited in claim 23.

A “burst release of less than 15% of the active ingredient” is unclear. Is 15% of the active ingredient released in the burst release cycle or does the burst release put forth less than 15% of the active ingredient? Explanation/correction is respectfully requested.

To overcome the above rejection, the following below is suggested commensurate with the interview of 9/29/06:

- a) in claim 1, line 5, after “and” add ---up to 30 days---
- b) in claim 4, line 3, after “cellulosic” delete the comma
- c) in claim 6, line 1, after “claim” change 2 to 1
- d) delete/cancel claim 24

New suggestion from the above a-d

e) Cancel claims 4, 5 and 17 or remove from claims 4, 6 and 17 materials that are not oils and specify what the carrier is in claims 4 and 5, that is, “oleaginous carrier” or “cholesterol microsphere carrier.”

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Art Unit: 1618

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claim 1, 4-7, 10-17, 21-24 and 34 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-5 and 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,169,084 in view of Baxter et al. (US H0,000,672 H).

Issued method claim 7 administers olanzapine pamoate monohydrate of issued claims 3 and 5 for treating psychosis, acute mania or mild anxiety. In general, drugs, such as olanzapine pamoate monohydrate, are administered with one or more carriers. For example, Baxter in US H0,000,672 H at column 2, lines 62, 66 and 67 discloses the use of non-aqueous oleaginous liquid such as mineral oil, vegetable oil and hydrogenated fat as carrier for antifungal agent. Therefore, it is prima facie obvious to administer olanzapine pamoate monohydrate according to claims 7, 1 and 3-5 using carrier materials such as oleaginous liquid..

Response to Arguments

The examiner has taken note of applicant's clarification of the scope of the claims as it relates to the reasons for allowance. The clarification will be revisited once the claims are placed in condition for allowance by overcoming the rejections in this action.

Art Unit: 1618

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blessing M. Fubara whose telephone number is (571) 272-0594. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. (Monday to Thursday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on (571) 272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Blessing Fubara
Patent Examiner
Tech. Center 1600

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "mfubara", is written over the printed name "Blessing Fubara".